UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,936	10/30/2003	Andrew Rodney Ferlitsch	SLA1240	1036

7590 12/10/2008

Gerald W. Maliszewski
P.O. Box 270829
San Diego, CA 92198-2829

EXAMINER	
DHINGRA, PAWANDEEP	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/696,936	FERLITSCH, ANDREW RODNEY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 September 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5-11 and 16-25* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5-11 and 16-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the following communication: Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on 9/15/2008.
- Claims 1-2, 5-11 and 16-25 are now pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 9/15/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Mori fails to teach the limitation converting DDI data to GDI data as recited in claim 5.

In reply, examiner asserts that Mori does teach converting DDI data to GDI data. Examiner agrees with applicant that Mori does describe converting GDI data into DDI data but as disclosed in paragraph 188, the de-spooler regenerates the GDI data from the PDF or intermediate code created from the DDI data, see paragraphs 185-188. Hence, DDI data gets converted into GDI data later on.

Applicant further argues that neither Shimizu nor Mori teach the newly amended features of claim 1.

In reply, examiner asserts that since the combination of Shimizu and Mori have been shown to teach all the limitations of amended claim 1 (also see discussion of claim 1 below), applicant's rest of the arguments regarding the prima facie case of obviousness not being supported and combination of references does not disclose all the limitations of claim 1, have been rendered moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 11 recite the limitation "combinations of the above-mentioned types". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Examiner Notes

Examiner cites particular paragraphs, columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 10-11, 16-17 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Shimizu, US 2002/0054313 in view of Mori et al., US 2002/0069228.

Re claim 1, Shimizu discloses a method for reverse processing a document from a scan subsystem to a document processing application (see figures 1-3, note that communication in bi-directional between host 102 (processing application) and scan subsystem 101), the method comprising: at a scan subsystem, accepting scan data (see paragraphs 41 & 65); converting the scan data into a standard graphical interface format associated with a print engine system (see paragraph 41);

Mori teaches the image files/data is not limited to being created by various computer applications but can be received from a scanner and converted into intermediate image files (see paragraph 331); converting the data into a standard graphical interface format associated with a computer operating system (OS) (see paragraphs 179-180) (also see paragraphs 181-189); segmenting the standard graphical interface format data into data types selected from a group consisting of text, vectors, graphics, and combinations of the above-mentioned types (see paragraphs 185-186, note that the standard graphical interface formatted print data (print data can consist of text, graphics, etc.) is converted into PDF. And it is well known that by converting data into PDF, PDF segments the data into data types consisting of text,

graphics, etc.); at a document processing application (i.e. application program 201), converting the segmented standard graphical interface format data into an internal representation (IR) data format proprietary to the document processing application (see paragraphs 185-186, note that PDF represents IR data format proprietary to the document processing application); and, parsing the document processing application IR data into a standard language document format specified for use with the document processing application (see paragraphs 185-208).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the printing & image processing system as disclosed by Shimizu to include the print control system and method as taught by Mori in order to provide the scan data of Shimizu to the system of Mori for the benefit of performing improved document processing and having an edit function for document data generated by a document processing program as taught by Mori in paragraph 1.

Re claim 2, Mori further teaches saving the standard language document in storage memory (see paragraphs 173-208).

Re claim 5, Shimizu discloses converting the scan data into standard graphical interface format associated with a print engine system (see paragraph 41).

Mori teaches the image files/data is not limited to being created by various computer applications but can be received from a scanner and converted into intermediate image files (see paragraph 331); converting the data into device dependent data (DDI) (see paragraphs 179-189) and converting the data to the

standard graphical interface (see discussion of claim 1 above) includes converting the DDI data to graphics device interface (GDI) data (see paragraph 188, note that the de-spooler regenerates the GDI data from the PDF or intermediate code created from the DDI data, see paragraphs 185-188. Hence, DDI data gets converted into GDI data).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the printing & image processing system as disclosed by Shimizu to include the print control system and method as taught by Mori in order to provide the scan data of Shimizu to the system of Mori for the benefit of performing improved document processing and having an edit function for document data generated by a document processing program as taught by Mori in paragraph 1.

Re claim 6, Shimizu discloses accepting scan data includes accepting proprietary formatted scan data (see paragraph 41); converting the proprietary scan data into a standard graphical interface format associated with a print engine system (see paragraph 41).

Mori teaches the image files/data is not limited to being created by various computer applications but can be received from a scanner and converted into intermediate image files (see paragraph 331), converting the data into DDI data (see paragraph 180) includes converting the proprietary data to an operating system (OS) specific DDI data format (see paragraphs 179-186); and, converting the DDI data to GDI data includes converting the OS specific DDI data to a standard GDI data format (see paragraphs 180-188 and see explanation for claim 5 given above).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the printing & image processing system as disclosed by Shimizu to include the print control system and method as taught by Mori in order to provide the scan data of Shimizu to the system of Mori for the benefit of performing improved document processing and having an edit function for document data generated by a document processing program as taught by Mori in paragraph 1.

Re claim 7, Shimizu discloses accepting scan data includes accepting scan data from a device selected from the group including a scanning device, facsimile device, electronic whiteboard, tablet personal computer, and a storage device (see paragraphs 34-65).

Re claim 10, Shimizu discloses at a print subsystem, converting the standard graphic interface format into scan data; and, converting the scan data into printer-ready scan data (see paragraphs 34-65, note that the print data in standard graphic interface format and print command are transmitted from the host to the printer system and the printer system then converts that data into printer specific and printer ready data just as it does for data scanned during copy operation).

Mori further teaches converting document processing application IR data (PDF) into the standard graphic interface format associated with the computer OS (see paragraphs 180-188, note that GDI function gets regenerated from the PDF file).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the printing & image processing system as disclosed by Shimizu

to include the print control system and method as taught by Mori in order to provide the scan data of Shimizu to the system of Mori for the benefit of performing improved document processing and having an edit function for document data generated by a document processing program as taught by Mori in paragraph 1.

Re Claims 11, 16-17 & 20 recite identical features, as claims 1, 5-7 & 10 except claims 11, 16-17 & 20 are apparatus claims. Thus, arguments made for claims 1, 5-7 & 10 are applicable for claims 11, 16-17 & 20.

Re claim 21, Shimizu further discloses a memory having an interface to accept the standard language document for persistent storage (see paragraphs 34-65, 72-83).

Mori also teaches a memory having an interface to accept the standard language document for persistent storage (see paragraph 173-208).

Re claim 22, Mori teaches converting document processing application IR data (PDF) into the standard graphic interface format includes converting to GDI data (see paragraphs 180-188, note that GDI function gets regenerated from the PDF file).

Shimizu discloses converting the standard graphic interface format data into scan data includes converting GDI data to DDI data (see paragraphs 34-65, note that the print data in standard graphic interface format and print command are transmitted from the host to the printer system and the printer system then converts that data into printer specific (DDI) and printer ready data just as it does for data scanned during copy operation).

Re claim 23, Mori further teaches supplying the IR data (PDL or PDF files) to a user interface (UI) display (preview display) (see paragraphs 186-197); accepting user commands at the UI (see paragraphs 203-207); and, manipulating the IR data in response to the user commands (see paragraphs 199-208, note that the IR data (PDF data) is displayed to a user at a UI, where a user can provide editing commands at the UI and the PDF data gets edited in response to user instructions).

Re claim 24, claim 24 recites identical features, as claims 10 & 22, except claim 24 is an apparatus claim. Thus, arguments made for claims 10 & 22 are applicable for claim 24.

Re claim 25, claim 25 recites identical features, as claim 23, except claim 25 is an apparatus claim. Thus, arguments made for claim 23 are applicable for claim 25.

5. Claims 8-9, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Shimizu, US 2002/0054313 in view of Mori et al., US 2002/0069228 further in view of well known art.

Re claim 8, Shimizu discloses converting the scan data into a standard graphical interface format associated with a print engine system (see paragraph 41).

Mori teaches the image files/data is not limited to being created by various computer applications but can be received from a scanner and converted into intermediate image files (see paragraph 331), converting the data into a DDI data (see paragraphs 179-185).

Shimizu and Mori fail to explicitly disclose scan data includes journaled scan data. However, Official Notice is taken to note that ability to scan journaled data is notoriously well known and commonly used in the art. It would have been obvious to scan documents including journaled documents in addition to other common document formats and then convert them to DDI data for the benefit of providing the user with increased flexibility and options.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the printing & image processing system as disclosed by Shimizu to include the print control system and method as taught by Mori in order to provide the scan data of Shimizu to the system of Mori for the benefit of performing improved document processing and having an edit function for document data generated by a document processing program as taught by Mori in paragraph 1.

Re claim 9, Shimizu discloses converting scan data includes: despooling the scan data (see paragraphs 34-65, 72-83), and converting the scan data into a standard graphical interface format associated with a print engine system (see paragraph 41).

Mori teaches the image files/data is not limited to being created by various computer applications but can be received from a scanner and converted into intermediate image files (see paragraph 331), converting the data into a DDI data (see paragraphs 179-185), respooling the DDI data (see paragraphs 179-189); and, wherein converting the DDI data to GDI data includes subsequently despooling the DDI for conversion into GDI data (see paragraphs 179-189).

Official Notice is taken to note that ability to scan journaled data is notoriously well known and commonly used in the art. It would have been obvious to scan documents including journaled documents in addition to other common document formats and then convert them to DDI data for the benefit of providing the user with increased flexibility and options.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify the printing & image processing system as disclosed by Shimizu to include the print control system and method as taught by Mori in order to provide the scan data of Shimizu to the system of Mori for the benefit of performing improved document processing and having an edit function for document data generated by a document processing program as taught by Mori in paragraph 1.

Re Claims 18-19, claims 18-19 recite identical features, as claims 8-9, except claims 18-19 are apparatus claims. Thus, arguments made for claims 8-9 are applicable for claims 18-19.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAWANDEEP S. DHINGRA whose telephone number is (571) 270-1231. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:30-7:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/P. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625